REMARKS

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A)

The Examiner has rejected independent claims 1, 20, 21, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patel et al. . . . in view of Szutu." *Office Action*, 2. The Applicants respectfully traverse.

As the Examiner notes, Patel et al. does not teach "reducing each of the all instances of the items of a certain type for each of the one or more items of a certain type to a canonical equivalent that identifies a group of synonymous words, numbers, symbols, or phrases, and wherein the canonical equivalent represents each of the all instances of items of a certain type regardless of individual format of each of the all instances of items of the certain type." *Office Action*, 3. The Examiner contends, however, that Patel et al. teaches "determining whether each of the all instances of the items of a certain type for each one or more items of a certain type meets a criterion" and "classifying the message based on whether each of the all instances of the items of certain type for each of the one or more items of a certain type are determined to meet the criterion." *Office Action*, 3. **These teachings are not what are claimed in the presently pending independent claims.**

Independent claims 1, 20, 21, and 25 recite "determining whether the **canonical equivalent** of each of the all instances of the items of a certain type for each of the one or more items of a certain type meets a criterion, the criterion corresponding to an acceptable item" and "classifying the message based on whether the **canonical equivalent** of each of the all instances of the items of a certain type for each of the one or more items of a certain type are determined to meet the criterion." Since Patel et al. admittedly does not disclose any canonical equivalents, it cannot disclose the foregoing elements, all of which require a canonical equivalent.

8

The Examiner does, however, contend that Szutu discloses "reducing each of the all instances of the items of a certain type for each of the one or more items of a certain type to a canonical equivalent that identifies a group of synonymous words, numbers, symbols, or phrases, and wherein the canonical equivalent represents each of the all instances of items of a certain type regardless of individual format of each of the all instances of items of the certain type." *Office Action,* 4. The Examiner notes that Szutu discloses performing "a normalization to convert the user name of the e-mail address of the incoming e-mail into a normalized incoming e-mail address." *Office Action,* 4. User name normalization, however, is not "reducing each of the all instances of the items of a certain type for each of the one or more items of a certain type to a canonical equivalent." Normalization is concerned with determining a unique identifier uniquely associated with a particular Internet user. *See* Szutu, page 3, [0019]. For example, the unique identifier of 123-456-7890@MailAttel.com is the 123-456-7890. *See* Szutu, page 3, [0019]. In contrast, reduction to canonical equivalent as set forth in the independent claims of the present application is concerned with representing same information. A canonical equivalent, therefore, of 1-800-555-5555 or 1(800)555-5555 may be 18005555555.

Szutu further fails to disclose "determining whether the canonical equivalent of each of the all instances of the items of a certain type for each of the one or more items of a certain type meets a criterion, the criterion corresponding to an acceptable item" or "classifying the message based on whether the canonical equivalent of each of the all instances of the items of a certain type for each of the one or more items of a certain type are determined to meet the criterion." Because incoming e-mail addresses are not part of the **message body** but rather part of a header, Szutu also does not disclose "parsing the **message body** to determine whether the **message body** includes one or more items of a certain type" or anything to do with "items of a certain type" included in the message body.

9

The Examiner further contends that the motivation to combine Szutu with Patel et al. is "to circumvent some of the requirements for exact input matching with the registered user input." *Office Action*, 4. Szutu discloses a normalization process so that "the user does not have to input the user name of the e-mail address....as exact as now required by a conventional Internet Service Provider (ISP)." Szutu, page 2, [0011] This purported motivation is not applicable to the Applicants' presently pending independent claims, which do not involve user input. There is, therefore, no need to circumvent any requirements for matching with any user input. The Examiner's motivation therefore fails and the required *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made.

As such, the Applicants believe that Patel et al. alone or in combination with Szutu fails to disclose all the elements of the independent claims 1, 20, 21 and 25. Further, because each of the dependent claims incorporates by reference all the limitations of the independent claim from which it depends, Patel et al. and Szutu also fail to render obvious dependent claims 3-7, 13-14, 17-19, 23, and 25.

The Examiner has rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Patel et al. in view of Szutu and U.S. patent publication 2003/0204569 (hereinafter Andrews et al.). *Office Action*, 7. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 24 depends from and incorporates all the limitations of claim 1. As discussed above, Patel et al. and Szutu fail to disclose the elements of claim 1. Further, the Applicants contend that the combination of Patel et al., Szutu, and Andrews et al. fails to disclose, for example, "reducing each of the all instances of the items of a certain type for each of the one or more items of a certain type to a canonical equivalent," as incorporated in claim 24.

10

The Examiner has rejected claims 10, 11, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Patel et al. in view of Szutu and U.S. patent publication 2003/0105827 (hereinafter Tan et al.). *Office Action*, 8. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 10, 11, and 22 directly or indirectly depend from and incorporates all the limitations of claim 1. As discussed above, Patel et al. and Szutu fail to disclose the elements of claim 1. Further, the Applicants contend that the combination of Patel et al., Szutu, and Tan et al. fails to disclose, for example, "reducing each of the all instances of the items of a certain type for each of the one or more items of a certain type to a canonical equivalent," as incorporated in claims 10, 11, and 22.

11

CONCLUSION

The Applicants have evidenced the failure of Patel et al. and Szutu —either alone or in combination with Andrews et al. or Tan et al.—to disclose each and every element of the independent claims 1, 20, 21, and 25. The Applicants have also evidenced the lack of motivation to combine Patel et al. and Szutu.

Any claim dependent upon one of the aforementioned independent claims—either directly or via an intermediate dependent claim—is allowable for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends. As such, each and every one of the dependent claims of the present application are also in condition for allowance.

As all rejections have been overcome, the Applicants contend the present application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative with any questions concerning the present amendment.

Respectfully submitted,
Jonathan Oliver et al.

February 28, 2008   By: _____
                                                    Tam Thanh Pham (Reg. No. 50,565)
                                                    CARR & FERRELL *LLP*
                                                    2200 Geng Road
                                                    Palo Alto, CA 94303
                                                    T: 650.812.3400
                                                    F: 650.812.3444

12